

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This is in response to the Official Action of June 8, 2005. In that Office Action, the Examiner had again raised the question regarding the priority claim. He also indicated that claims 47 to 57 and 69 to 77 were allowed that claims 63 and 79 were objected to and that claims 58 to 62, 64 to 68, 78, 80 and 81 were rejected.

Claims 58, 60, 63, and 81 have been cancelled without prejudice. New claims 82 and 83 have been introduced into the application and claims 59, 61, 62 to 68, 78 and 79 have been amended. New claim 83 is based on a part of now cancelled claim 60. None of the new claims or amended claims raise new issues or include new matter. Further, the number of claims now pending is less than that previously paid for, thus no additional fee is due. The Examiner has objected to claim 81 as being a substantial duplicative of claim 66. Claim 81 been cancelled and claim 66 has been amended to depend on new claim 82.

SPE Gulakowski is thanked for the telephone interview of July 26, 2005 and his assistance in resolving the issue regarding the priority claim and acknowledging the priority claim is proper. Accordingly, there is no need to file an application data sheet as suggested in the Office Action of June 8, 2005.

Claims 58 to 62, 64 to 68, 78, 80 and 81 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as unpatentable over Rossitto in view of Helmeke and Yang.

Applicants incorporate their previous response as set forth in the Amendment of March 7, 2005 to the rejection based on this combination of references.

Claim 58 has been cancelled. New claim 82 has been introduced into the application. Claim 82 is based on previously existing claims 58 and 63 which had

previously depended on claim 58. In the Office Action, the Examiner had objected to claim 63 and 79 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim and indicated they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Since claim 82 is based on the combination of claims 58 and 63, it is submitted that claim 82 is allowable over the art. Claim 79 recited an average molecular weight range and softening range within that recited in claim 63. Claim 79 has been amended to depend on new claim 82 and therefore should also be allowable.

Claims 59, 61, 62, 64 to 68 and 78 each previously depended from claim 58. These claims have now been amended to depend from new claim 82. Accordingly, it is submitted that those claims are now also allowable.

The Examiner has replied to Applicants' previously submitted arguments with respect to claim 58 and the claims dependent thereon and indicated that there is no recitation that the reactive species are present in separate components. It is submitted that the Examiner has overlooked that claim 58 (and likewise new claim 82) specifically recites mixing or blending of the first and second components. This distinguishes over the cited art. It is thus submitted that the Examiner's criticism of the previously submitted arguments is not justified. However, since claim 82 includes the limitation of claim 63 and claim 79 now depends from claim 82, the Examiner's comments with respect to the previously submitted arguments are now moot.

Further, the Examiner's explanation of motivation to combine the references relies on a reference not cited. Thus, the record fails to properly establish motivation for the combination.

It is submitted that the Examiner's analysis of *In re Pluddeman*, *In re Kuehl* and *Ex parte Glaister* is in error. The Examiner's point of distinction is his assertion that the now cited prior art shows the same process. However, the prior art does not show or suggest the claimed process.


In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the application with claims 47 to 57, 59, 61, 62, 64 to 80, 82 and 83 are earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the Applicants' undersigned attorney to resolve any remaining issues after reviewing the foregoing.

It is believed that no fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the present application; however, if any fees or charges are required at this time, they may be charged to our Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 03-2412.

Respectfully submitted,

COHEN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE

By 

Vincent M. Fazzari
Reg. No. 26,879
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210
New York, New York 10176
(212) 687-2770

Dated: July 29, 2005